

SENATOR SCHMIT: I'm sorry, but I was reading at the same time you were speaking. Can you...

SENATOR VICKERS: It is not the intent, at least, to require each employee to have a certification or a licensure...

SENATOR SCHMIT: No, that is correct.

SENATOR VICKERS: ...so I guess I was curious as to what that language, at the bottom of page 17, really was referring to then.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Well, I think this, Senator Vickers, there is...there may be employees who may desire to have that authority...that certification, but who may not be deemed qualified, but they may request the examination, I would guess, and that would allow them to...

SENATOR VICKERS: In other words, that is just to be discretionary only is what you are...what the intent is.

SENATOR SCHMIT: That's right.

SENATOR VICKERS: So that it is not a matter of requiring any individuals who may not be a supervisor or a contractor, but if they choose to, this language is simply to allow them to do so.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Yes, then they may make that application.

SENATOR VICKERS: Okay, thank you. Then on Section 34, Senator Schmit, and this is one that I really do have some real concern about because I agree with you, there are a number of abandoned wells that are not properly plugged. Would it not be wise to instead of, as I read Section 34 it applies only to the licensed well contractor. Now, in many instances it is actually the pump installation contractor who removes the old piping from an abandoned well, not a well driller. Would it not be wise to include the pump installation contractor in that language, in Section 34, Senator Schmit?

SENATOR SCHMIT: Well, I think perhaps we could do that if you wanted to. Actually the water well contractor being responsible I think would be the one who would have to